

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/013,114	VERCAEMER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Roger J. Schoeppel	3672	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Roger J. Schoeppel. (3) ____.
- (2) Van Someren, Appl.Rep. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 11 January 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-36.

Identification of prior art discussed: ____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Agreement reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner suggested applicant to be more specific in the independent claims as regards use of an insertion guide as in setting of a sand screen.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Roger J. Schoeppel
Examiner's signature, if required